

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/815,361	03/31/2004	Michael Cosci	8299	
7590 06/08/2005			EXAMINER	
G. Marlin Knight			OLSON, JASON C	
Hoyt & Knight PO Box 1320			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER	
Pioneer, CA 95666			2651	
			DATE MAILED: 06/08/2003	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	T					
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
000 4.45.20	10/815,361	COSCI ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jason C. Olson	2651				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from , cause the application to become ABANDONED	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 Ju	ılv 2004.					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
Disposition of Claims						
 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o 						
Application Papers						
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on <u>31 March 2004</u> is/are: a)⊠ accepted or b)□ objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See	e 37 CFR 1.85(a).				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) ☐ All ^ b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority document 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati rity documents have been receive u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)		(070, 440)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>07/08/04</u> .		atent Application (PTO-152)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Candela Instruments (http://www.candela-inst.com) and the applicant admitted prior art.

Regarding claim, the applicant admitted prior art teaches writing a set of servo tracks on the magnetic disk, the set of servo tracks including a track zero (see page 1, first paragraph of Background of the Invention of the instantaneous invention. It is obvious to an artisan in the art that any track can be labeled whatever the choice may be by the designer, such as zero. Furthermore, it is obvious to an artisan in the art that any disk that contains servo tracks has a track that is nearest the inner diameter, as described in the specification of the instantaneous invention as track zero). The applicant admitted prior art fails to teach placing the disk on a hub for spinning the disk; spinning the disk at a selected rate; observing the track zero on the magnetic disk using Kerr effect microscopy device; and measuring a first distance from a predetermined point to a first selected point on the track zero. However, Candela Instruments is relied upon to teach placing the disk on a hub for spinning the disk; spinning the disk at a selected rate; observing the track zero on the magnetic disk using Kerr effect microscopy device; and measuring a first distance from a predetermined point to a first selected point on the track

zero (see product details of the OSA 5120 and as described in the specification of the instantaneous invention starting on page 4, paragraph 3, through page 5. The method described in the specification is a method for using the apparatus OSA 5120). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon servo writing of the applicant admitted prior art by applying the teaching of using the OSA 5120 as described in the specification of the instantaneous invention as taught by Candela Instruments for the purpose of reducing time and expense in an analysis procedure as described by Candela Instruments.

Claims 2-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Berger (US 6,624,627).

Regarding claims 2-5, the combination of the applicant admitted prior art and Candela. Instruments fail to teach measuring second, third and fourth distances from a predetermined point to a second, third and fourth selected points on the track zero where the selected second point is 90 degrees around the disk from the first selected point, the third selected point is 180 degrees around the disk from the first selected point and the fourth selected point is 270 degrees around the disk from the first selected point and averaging first, second, third and fourth distances to obtain a single measurement indicative of a position of track zero on the magnetic disk. (see col. 3, ln. 52-col. 4, ln. 4 and col. 4, ln. 46-49 and figure 3C, items S1, 208, 202, S2, 210, 204, S3, 212, and 224; track 224 is the innermost track (or track zero) on which measurements are taken at selected points around the track to determine the disk center (or correct track zero) in order to correct track writing. It is interpreted by the examiner that common

Application/Control Number: 10/815,361

Art Unit: 2651

curve-fitting algorithms includes averaging. The placement of the measurement points is given little patentable weight because it is considered mere design choice because no unexpected results occurred). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to improve upon the inspection process of the combination of applicant admitted prior art and Candela Instruments by applying the teaching of measuring specific points around track zero as taught by Berger for the purpose defining a disk center for correcting track writing.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Toho Technology Corporation

(http://216.239.39.104/translate_c?hl=en&sl=ja&u=http://www.toho-tec.co.jp/new/candela.html) is cited for stating the fact the Candela OSA5120 was introduced into the market and readily available to the public before on September 3, 2001. Leigh et al. (US 6,658,922) is cited for optical equipment assemblies and techniques indexed to a common spindle.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jason C. Olson whose telephone number is (571)272-7560. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Thursday 7:30-5:30; alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dave Hudspeth can be reached on (571)272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/815,361

Art Unit: 2651

Page 5.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

JCO May 31, 2005

DAVID HUDSPETH SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600